## TENT COOPERATION TREAT

From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY E INING AUTHORITY DIANE B. ELDERKIN, ESQ. WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ MACKIEWICZ & AUG 1 4 2000 NORRIS LLP WRITTEN OPINION ONE LIBERTY PLACE- 46TH FLOOR Woodcock Washburn Kurtz PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19103 Mackiewicz & Norris LLP (PCT Rule 66) Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 10 AUG 2000 REPLY DUE Applicant's or agent's file reference within ONE months from the above date of mailing LDS-0527 International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) PCT/US99/14351 24 JUNE 1999 26 JUNE 1998 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): A61K 9/27, 31/56 and US Cl.: 424/450; 514/179, 180 Applicant LDS TECHNOLOGIES, INC. 1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority. 2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Basis of the opinion H Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability Ш IV Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement VΙ Certain documents cited VII Certain defects in the international application VIII Certain observations on the international application 3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion. When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension... see Rule 66.2(d). How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Authorized Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231 Telephone No. (703) 308-0193 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230

For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.

For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 26 OCTOBER 2000

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (July 1998) \*

4. The final date by which the international preliminary

Also

Internation No.
Pr 99/14351

I. B	asis of the op	inion		, 		
1. With	regard to the e	elements of the intern	national application:*			
	the international application as originally filed					
믉	the description	on:	,			
X	pages			as originally filed		
	pages	NONE				
	pages		, filed with the letter of	, Thed with the demand		
	pubes		, med with the fetter of			
$\begin{bmatrix} x \end{bmatrix}$	the claims:					
بت	pages	NONE		, as originally filed		
	pages	NONE	, as amended (together with any			
	pages					
	pages	NONE	, filed with the letter of			
_						
X	the drawings					
	pages			, as originally filed		
	pages	NONE		, filed with the demand		
	pages	NONE	, filed with the letter of			
X		listing part of the				
	pages					
	pages	NONE		, filed with the demand		
	pages	NONE	, filed with the letter of	·		
the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).  the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).  the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/						
or 55.3).  3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:						
contained in the international application in printed form.						
filed together with the international application in computer readable form.						
吊	furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.					
H	furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.					
H	The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the					
international application as filed has been furnished.  The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the writen sequence listing habeen furnished.						
					4. X	The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:
	X the des	scription, pages	NONE			
		iims, Nos.				
	1	wings, sheets/fig				
5.			if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since this indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).	hey have been considered to go		
	lacement sheets is opinion as "o		rnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation	under Article 14 are referred to		

Intern al application No.

PCT/<u>US</u>99/14351

r industrial applicability; V. Reasoned statement under Rule عد.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive si citations and explanations supporting such statement 1 statement Claims 1 and 5-33 Novelty (N) none Claims YES Inventive Step (IS) Claims Claims 1 and 5-33 \_ NO YES Claims 1 and 5-33 Industrial Applicability (IA) Claims NONE NO 2. citations and explanations Claims 1 and 5-33 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Benjamin et al. (US Patent no. 4,782,047) in view of Ly et al. (abstract). Benjamin et al., teach the use of anti-inflaminatory steroids aqueous compositions for nasal administration comprising a surfactant and the conventional additives and carriers. See the entire document, especially the claims. However, the primary reference does not teach the use of a high-HLB surfactant component in the composition. Ly et al., abstract discloses that tocopherol ester-linked polyethylene glycol succinate 1000 (TPGS) is known to have a high-HLB value and "have potential as enhancers of the aqueous solubility of poorly water soluble drugs". One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to use a high-HLB surfactant such as taught by the secondary reference in the compositions of the primary reference for further enhancing the aqueous solubility of the steroids and the added benefits of using Vitamin E derivative in the therapeutic composition. To vary the proportions of the ingredients in the compositions is within the skill of an ordinary art skilled. Claims 1 and 5-33 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2) and (4), because the prior art does not teach the claims as presented. Moreover, the claims have industrial applicability in the field of medicine. ----- NEW CITATIONS -----NONE

Intern. onal application No.

PC 99/14351

## VIII. Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claims 1 and 5-33 are objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) as lacking clarity under PCT Article 6 because the claims are indefinite for the following reason(s): The term "high" is a relative term and render the claims indefinite as to the claims metes and bounds.

Interra nal application No.

PCT \$89/14351

Supplemental	Box
--------------	-----

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII

Sheet 10

## TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.